

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Joe Nathan Sales, )  
                        )  
                        )  
Plaintiff,           ) C.A. No. 6:05-00313-HMH-BHH  
                        )  
                        )  
vs.                   ) **OPINION & ORDER**  
                        )  
                        )  
Greenville County School District, )  
                        )  
                        )  
Defendant.           )

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Rule 73.02 DSC.<sup>1</sup> Joe Nathan Sales (“Sales”), a pro se plaintiff, alleges that the Defendant retaliated against him for filing a discrimination charge with the EEOC.

On February 1, 2005, Sales filed the instant action. The Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment on November 2, 2005. On December 2, 2005, Sales filed a response in opposition to the Defendant’s motion. On March 23, 2006, in her Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Bruce H. Hendricks recommended granting the Defendant’s motion for summary judgment on the grounds that Sales’ claims are time-barred. Sales filed objections to the Report and Recommendation on March 28, 2006.

---

<sup>1</sup> The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Sales' objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.

It is therefore

**ORDERED** that the Defendant's motion for summary judgment, docket number 27, is granted.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
March 31, 2006

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.